1... FENT COOPERATION TREATY

| From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUT | HORITY | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| To: ROBERT C. HYTA WELLS, ST. JOHN P.S. | | PCT | | |
| 601 WEST 1ST AVENUE, SUITE 1300 SPOKANE, WA 99201 | | WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY | | |
| | | n i Dia i i | | |
| | | | (PCT Rule 43bis.1) | |
| | | Date of mailing (day/month/year) | 23 JUN 200 9 | |
| Applicant's or agent's file reference | | FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below | | |
| GR61-014 International application No. | International filing date | (day/month/year) | Priority date (day/month/year) | |
| PCT/US04/12849 | 26 April 2004 (26.04.20 | | 25 April 2003 (25.04.2003) | |
| International Patent Classification (IPC) | or both national classificat | ion and IPC | | |
| IPC(7): H 01 J 49/00 and US Cl.: 250/ Applicant | 282, 281,288,286 | | | |
| GRIFFIN ANALYTICAL TECHNOLO | OGIES, INC. | | • | |
| 1 This coincide and in discoince | lasian es els Callannian isan | | | |
| 1. This opinion contains indications re | lating to the following item | S: | | |
| Box No. I Basis of th | e opinion | | | |
| Box No. II Priority | | | | |
| Box No. III Non-establ | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability | | | |
| Box No. IV Lack of un | Lack of unity of invention | | | |
| | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement | | | |
| Box No. VÍ Certain do | cuments cited | | | |
| Box No. VII Certain de | Certain defects in the international application | | | |
| Box No. VIII Certain obs | Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application | | | |
| 2. FURTHER ACTION | | | | |
| International Preliminary Examining Authority other than this one to be that written opinions of this International If this opinion is, as provided above | ng Authority ("IPEA") ex- the IPEA and the chosen II ional Searching Authority of e, considered to be a writte there appropriate, with ame efore the expiration of 22 n | cept that this does PEA has notified the will not be so consider on opinion of the IP endments, before the | EA, the applicant is invited to submit to the e expiration of 3 months from the date of | |
| 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. | | | | |
| Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US | | Authorized officer | | |
| Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents | | John R Lee | DEBORAH A. THOMAS | |

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230
Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

Telephone No. 703-308-0

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/12849

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

| 1. | Statement |
|----|-----------|
|----|-----------|

| Novelty (N) | Claims 2, 12, 17, 18, 23-26 | YES |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----|
| | Claims 1,3-11,13-16,19-22, and 27-51 | NO |
| Inventive step (IS) | Claims NONE | YES |
| | Claims 1-51 | NO |
| Industrial applicability (IA) | Claims 1-51 | YES |
| | Claims NONE | NO |

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1,3-11,13-16,19-22, and 27-51 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by US Pat No 6,541,765 issued to Vestal

Vestal discloses an ionization source configured to apply different ionization energies to a sample to provide different sample characteristics (see for example col.5, lines 45-54; col.6, lines 41-59).

Vestal discloses a processing circuitry configured to process the different sample characteristics to identify the sample (see for example col. 12, lines 24-26).

As per claim 3, Vestal discloses the sample characteristic is mass spectra (col. 1, lines 19-26).

As per claims 4-6, 8-11,15, 19-21 and 27-51, Vestal discloses two data sets (see col.11, lines 13-34), parameter modifications (col.8, lines 40-45), and mass spectra differences (see for example col.24, lines 23-48).

As per claims 7,13-14, and 16, Vestal discloses a mass spectrometer having a ionization component configured to receive a sample and provide a first ionization energy to the sample to form a first and a second ionized analyte and a processing circuit (see for example col.6, lines 41-59).

As per claim 22, Vestal discloses an ionization source configured to apply different ionization energies to a sample to provide different sample characteristics (see for example col.5, lines 45-54; col.6, lines 41-59). Vestal discloses also two data sets (see col.11, lines 13-34), parameter modifications (col.8, lines 40-45), and mass spectra differences (see for example col.24, lines 23-48). Vestal further discloses a mass spectrometer having a ionization component configured to receive a sample and provide a first ionization energy to the sample to form a first and a second ionized analyte and a processing circuit (see for example col.6, lines 41-59).

Claims 2,12,17-18, and 23-26 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Vestal '765 in view of US Pat No 6,717,130 issued to Bateman et al.

Vestal discloses the claimed invention except for an electron impact source.

However, Bateman et al teach the art-recognized equivalence of an electron impact source and laser-assisted ionization (see col.6, lines 25-36).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan to substitute an electron impact source for a photo ionization source because the selection of art-recognized equivalent sources falls within the level of routine skill in the art.

As claims 25-26, Bateman et al also teach the inclusion of an ion trap (see col.6, lines 52-58).

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US04/12849

| Box N | lo. I Basis of this opinion |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | |
| | regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which is filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. |
| | This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)). |
| 2. With claim | regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the ned invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of: |
| a. | type of material |
| | a sequence listing |
| | table(s) related to the sequence listing |
| b. | format of material |
| | in written format |
| | in computer readable form |
| | |
| c. | time of filing/furnishing |
| | contained in international application as filed. |
| | filed together with the international application in computer readable form. |
| | furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search. |
| 3. | In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished. |
| 4. Addit | onal comments: |
| | · |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |